



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

X. —EIS in the Accusative Plural of the Latin Third Declension

BY PROFESSOR ANDREW RUNNI ANDERSON

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

ON the text and orthography of Latin authors scholastic theory has exerted considerable influence. The *ei*-readings in the manuscripts of Plautus¹ are an instance in point. This paper is intended to discuss the use of the ending *-eis* in the accusative plural of the Latin third declension, its extension to the nominative, its relation to Greek and Umbrian, the periods of its use, and to examine the testimonia, inscriptions, manuscripts, and, to some extent, the editions as to their reliability and significance.

In the accusative *-eis* does not seem to have come into use until after the diphthong *ei* had been reduced to the monophthong *ī*, *i.e.* after the death of Plautus (184 B.C.). Inasmuch as it is merely graphic for earlier *-īs* (<**īns*), it is misleading to call it archaic, and incorrect to refer to it as containing a diphthong. It is also incorrect, at least as far as native Latin words are concerned, to regard the use of the termination *-eis* in the accusative and nominative plural of the third declension as due to Greek influence. For in Greek the *-eis* sometimes found in the accusative was originally a nominative formation which in some instances by case-confusion came to supplant the true accusative form. An instructive parallel, however, is furnished by the Umbrian, in which there occur the accusative forms *avef tref*, *aveif treif*, *avif trif*. In Umbrian, however, none of these forms invaded the nominative, the latter keeping its terminations *-es* *-er* intact.

TESTIMONIA

I. Charisius, 129, 19 K:

FONTES. Quorum nominum genetivi pluralis ante um syllabam i litteram merebuntur, accusativus, inquit Plinius, per eis loquetur:

¹ Vid. *T.A.P.A.* xxxvii, 73 f.

montium monteis; licet Varro, inquit, exemplis hanc regulam confutare temptarit istius modi: falcium falces non falceis facit, nec has merceis nec hos axeis lintreis ventreis stirpeis urbeis corbeis vecteis inerteis (nepteis?). et tamen manus dat praemissae regulae ridicule, ut exceptis his nominibus valeat regula.

2. *Id.* 129, 25 K:

FUNES, licet grammatici velint, genetivis tam singulari quam plurali si i littera intererit, accusativum pluralem in eis exire, ut huius funis horum funium hos funeis. quam regulam negat Plinius vires habere potuisse. errant enim qui putant ea nomina, quae nominativo singulari et genetivo per is terminabuntur et genetivos plurales per ium loquuntur, accusativos in eis (funeis) posse dicere, quod negat Plinius.

3. *Id.* 137, 23 K:

MONTEIS. Licet Pomponius Secundus poeta, ut refert Plinius, propter homonymum nominativi accusativo casu omnes non putet dici, sed omneis, tamen idem Plinius in eodem permanet dicens, omnes tunc demum posse dici accusativo, ut canes, quando genetivus pluralis (horum canum) ante um i non habet.

4. *Id.* 139, 22 K:

OMNES Sallustius in Catilina (51) '*omnes, p.c., qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio amicitia ira atque misericordia vacuos esse decet*,' cum idem in eodem (1) '*omneis homines qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus (summa ope niti decet)*'; quod ratione potius esse subnixum sub f (fonteis) et sub m littera (monteis) poterit ostendi. sed Asper, si genetivus inquit omnium i litteram natura retinet, et in accusativo esse servandam.

5. *Id.* 129, 31 K:

ferocior tam quam peior melior ait Stilo in eis accusativo posse proferri, ferocioreis.

6. *Id.* 130, 1 K:

ferientium ferienteis idem Stilo putat facere debere, ut docenteis saltanteis, quoniam quaecumque secum verbi iura traxissent, ea accusativis pluralibus, adiuvante (re) dumtaxat genetivo plurali, in eis sonarent.

7. *Id.* 137, 27 K:

maioreis Cicero, ut Plinius in eodem libro notat.

8. *Id.* 130, 4 K :

facilioreis Caecilius, inquit Plinius. idem et sanctioreis ait.

9. Scaurus, *de Orthogr.* VII, 32, 21 K :

Singularis numerus per unam i litteram scribitur, ut docilis facilis, pluralis autem per e et i, ut facileis docileis, ut ex hoc appareat, utrum singularis sit appellatio an pluralis.

10. Terentianus, *de Syllabis*, 459 :

Sic erit nobis et ista rarior diphthongus ei,
 e videmus quando fixam principali in nomine : 460
 eitur in silvam, necesse est e et i conectere ;
 principali namque verbo nascitur quod est eo.
 sic oveis, plures (eis?) et omneis scribimus pluraliter ;
 non enim nunc addis e, sed permanet sicut fuit,
 lector et non singularem nominativum sciet, 465
 vel sequentem, qui prioris saepe similis editur.

The testimonia are here grouped all together to facilitate a general view of them ; but their full discussion will be deferred until the place where they chronologically belong. For the present only a few remarks of a general nature will be made. By specific statement or by their context the testimonia refer to the ending *-eis* as belonging to the accusative only. In 9, from Scaurus, and 10, from Terentianus, *-eis* might be regarded as both a nominative and an accusative ending, but it is likely that these grammarians had the accusative so firmly in mind that they did not take pains to specify. When Terentianus refers to the ending under discussion as containing a diphthong, he is uncritical ; but when he speaks of the form in *-eis* as helping to distinguish the (accusative) plural from the nominative and genitive singular, he touched upon the chief motive for using this orthography. It must not be concluded from 1 that Varro ever favored the accusative form in *-eis*. The only accusative terminations that Varro considered in the forms under discussion were those in *-ēs* and *-īs*. Anomalist that he was, he favored *falcium falcēs*, and rejected *falcīs* as well as its graphic equivalent *falceis*.

Assuming that in the ending under discussion *-eis* is merely a graphic device, it will be convenient to discuss the read-

ings containing it by periods in which they occur or seem to occur :

- I. The Archaic Period, the end of which, as far as it is sharply definable, coincides with the death of Plautus (184 B.C.).
- II. The Intermediate Period, from the death of Plautus to the Empire.
- III. The Period of the Empire.

I. THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

During this period *ei* with insignificant exceptions was used only for an original diphthong. If this is true, and *-eis* in the forms under discussion is merely graphic for *-īs*, such forms in *-eis* ought to be lacking in this period. If they do occur, (1) they would have to be explained as due to false restorations of later times, or (2) the monophthongization of the diphthong *ei* would have to be put back so as to admit these occurrences, or (3) a theory of *-eis* would have to be evolved that would explain the termination as containing a diphthong after all. The first of these explanations is altogether the most likely to be the true one.

Inscriptions: — CLASEIS, *C.I.L.* I, 195, 8; NAVEIS, bis, ut vid. *C.I.L.* I, 195, 12. The inscription of the Columna Rostrata dates ostensibly from the middle of the third century B.C., but the form in which we have it is a restoration of the reign of Claudius according to Ritschl and Mommsen, or of the time of Augustus according to Wölfflin.² Besides the accusative forms cited above, it has also the forms CLASES NAVALES OMNIS CARTACINIENSIS. While it cannot be regarded as certain that these inconsistencies of form are due to the fact that the inscription was restored, still it must for the present be regarded as having a value but little above that of a manuscript.

Authors: — Naevius ap. Charis. 239, 15 K (*Agitatoria*): currenteis;

Plautus: advenienteis, *Stich.* 682 A; aedeis, *Merc.* 786 A,

² *Sitzungsb. d. bayr. Acad. phil-hist.* Kl. 1890, p. 295 f.

Rud. 583 P; arteis, *Trin.* 236 A; aureis, *Epid.* 434 EJ, in ras. B, *Pers.* 182 A; aveis, *Most.* 47 in ras. B; compeceis (compe-deis), *Cist.* 244 A; egenteis, *Rud.* 409 P; leiteis, *Merc.* 281 A, *Stich.* 79 A; omneis, *Men.* 231 A, 237 A, *Merc.* 513 A, *Pers.* 325 A, *Stich.* 349 A; oveis, *Pseud.* 140 A; plureis, *Stich.* 607 A; treis, *Men.* 219 A; — total in Plautus, 19. I have elsewhere³ expressed the view that about one-third of the nearly four hundred *ei*-readings in our Mss. of Plautus are un-Plautine, and in this third the accusatives in *-eis* were classed. In the time that has elapsed since that article was published, no additional facts have been brought out that have changed my view.

II. FROM THE DEATH OF PLAUTUS TO THE EMPIRE

This is the period in which *-eis* in the accusative and nominative plural of the third declension attained the height of its usage, at least 32 out of a total of 40 instances of its occurrence in inscriptions coming within this period. Even so, however, the extent of its use was slight. The earliest occurrences are PONTEIS OMNEIS on the milestone of Popillius, *C.I.L.* I, 551, 132 B.C.

Inscriptions, accusative :

ALPEIS, *C.I.L.* I, 205, 2, 26 (49 B.C.); BASEIS, *ib.* 1146; CALLEIS, 200, 26 (111 B.C.); CIVEIS, 204, 2, 19 (72 B.C.); DECEMBREIS, quinquies, 202, 1, 7, 16, 20, 24, 28 (81 B.C.); FINEIS, bis, 199, 3, 28 (117 B.C.); ter, 204, 1, 13; *ib.* II, 33, 36 (72 B.C.); GENUATEIS, 199, 2 (117 B.C.); MUNICIPIEIS (pro-PEIS), 199, 2 (45 B.C.); OCTOBREIS, 590 (78 B.C.); OMNEIS, 551, 2 (132 B.C.); 199, 43 (117 B.C.); 202, 1, 32 (81 B.C.); PENATEIS, 197 (133-118 B.C.); PONTEIS, 551, 2 (132 B.C.); QUINCTILEIS, 603, 2 (58 B.C.); TRISTEIS, 1220; TURREIS, 1187; 1224 (34 B.C.); 1225 (belongs perhaps to the early empire); bis, 1230 (100 B.C.) — total 29 (28).

Inscriptions, nominative :

CEIVEIS, *C.I.L.* I, 198, 77 (123-122 B.C.); FINEIS, bis, 199, 3, 6 (117 B.C.); PELLEIS, 603, 16 (58 B.C.); — total 4. These

³ *T.A.P.A.* xxxvii (1906), 73-86, esp. 81.

are all the nominative occurrences I have been able to find in inscriptions. Note their rareness in comparison to those in the accusative. (The nominative plural forms in *-eis -es -is* sometimes found in the *o*-declension are to be explained as the originally diphthongal termination reënforced by *-s*, and have no further connection with the termination under consideration.)

Authors :

Caecilius Statius (†168 B.C.), *facilioreis sanctioreis*, vid. Testimonia, 8. Caecilius is the earliest author who is specifically reported as having used the accusative plural in *-eis*. This would be our earliest report involving the reduction of *ei* to a monophthong; but the report must be accepted with caution, for Pliny may have been reporting what he saw in a manuscript of Caecilius rather than by Caecilius, and unfortunately we cannot attach to this statement of Pliny the same degree of finality that we can to that of Probus when the latter says (Gellius, XIII, 21, 4) that he saw in Verg. *Georg.* I, 25, the form *urbis* in a manuscript corrected by Vergil's own hand, whereas in *Aen.* III, 106, Vergil used the form *urbes*.

Cato *ap.* Charis. 214, 29 K, *hosteis*. It is significant that the Mss. of Terence have no instances of the forms under consideration. Lucilius and Accius probably considered the orthography of such forms, but have left no specific record of their practice in regard to them. According to his rule of employing *ei* to represent *ī* of whatever origin, Accius probably used *-eis* in such forms; cf. PAASTORES along with PONTEIS OMNEIS in the Popillius inscription. If Lucilius was as critical in his use of *ei* as Kent makes him out to be,⁴ he would, of course, not have used *-eis* in these forms, and *lexeis*, 994 Marx, ought probably to be printed *λέξεις*.

Cicero, *maioreis*, vid. Testimonia, 7, where *notat* can hardly mean 'rejects.'

Aelius Stilo, *ferocioreis peioreis melioreis*, vid. Testimonia, 5; *ferienteis docenteis saltanteis*, *ib.* 6.

⁴ Kent in *A.J.P.* xxxii (1911), 272 f., and xxxiv (1913), 315 f. The literature is cited at the head of the latter article.

Lucretius, *mortaleis*, v, 1280 Q; *exitialeis* (nom.), II, 569, teste Lambino.

Sallust, *Cat.* I, *omneis*, vid. Testimonia, 4. This reading is not supported by the Mss. of Sallust.

Varro is the most important of those who have contributed to our understanding of the problem during this period. Above has been quoted (p. 129 f.) the testimony of Charisius, 129, 19 K, to the effect that Varro is credited by Pliny with rejecting the accusative forms *falceis merceis axeis lintreis ventreis stirpeis urbeis corbeis vecteis inerteis (nepteis ?)*. A comparison of this with Varro's own statements shows that Varro held the *-es* form of the accusative plural to be the correct one for these words, *falces*, etc.; i.e. by rejecting the form in *-eis* he rejected that in *-is* as well, as far as these words are concerned. Special attention may be called to one word: if he rejected *urbeis* in the accusative, he would *a fortiori* reject it in the nominative, as, for instance, *de Ling. Lat.* v, 143, where sometimes *urbeis* has been read, and where it is so reported by Neue-Wagener. Varro has given us the benefit of his opinion in this regard in his *de Ling. Lat.* VIII, 66 f.:

⟨Analogia⟩ si esset, negant ullum casum duobus modis debuisse dici, quod fit contra. nam sine reprehensione vulgo alii dicunt in singulari *hac ovi* et *avi*, alii *hac ove* et *ave*. in multitudine *hae puppis restis* et *hae puppes restes*. item quod in patrico casu hoc genus dispariliter dicatur *civitatum parentum* et *civitatum parentium*, in accusandi *hos montes fontes* et *hos montis fontis*. item cum, si sit analogia, debeant a similibus verbis similiter declinatis similia fieri, et id non fieri ostendi possit, despiciendam esse eam rationem. atqui ostenditur; nam quid potest similius esse quam *mens dens gens*, cum horum casus patricus et accusativus in multitudine sint dispariles? nam a primo fit *gentium* et *gentis*, utrobique ut sit *i*; ab secundo *mentium* et *mentes*, ut in priore solo sit *i*; ab tertio *dentum* et *dentes*, ut in neutro sit *i*.

Any one who would read *puppeis resteis fonteis monteis genteis* in the above must assume the burden of proof; for there is not the slightest evidence for the view that Varro ever used *-eis* in either the nominative or the accusative of the third declension. Neue-Wagener, 1³, 381 ff. quote a total of 25

instances of *-eis* in the nominative and accusative plural purporting to occur in the Florentinus F of Varro's *de Ling. Lat.*, but the Ms. does not support any of these forms;⁵ likewise the nominative *Aeoleis* quoted from *de Re Rust.* III, 1, 6, is a fiction, vid. Keil's note *ad loc.*

III. THE PERIOD OF THE EMPIRE

With the advent of the empire the first change to be noted is the recession of *-is* (and also of *-eis*) from the nominative plural, where very fitly *-es* was left in sole possession of the field. In the accusative of *i*-stems *-is* was regularized in the great authors of the Augustan Age,⁶ who seldom, if ever, had recourse to *-eis*, and before long *-es* was to prevail even in the accusative of *i*-stems. The rareness of the use of the termination *-eis* may be concluded from its practical disappearance from both public and private inscriptions, and I have found only four occurrences of it, all in the accusative:

CIVEIS, *C.I.L.* VIII, 2391 (third century); FINEIS, *ib.* VI, 29779 (perhaps belongs to Period II); TREIS, III, 562; TURREIS, x, 5683.

Authors:

The Mss. of Horace have no instances of *-eis* in either of our forms; in those of Vergil the only sure occurrence is *Georg.* 1, 2, viteis P., a Ms. unreliable in orthographic matters.⁷

⁵ Cf. the introduction of the edition of A. Spengel (1885), p. IV: "Saepe Victorius vocabulo *omnes* vel *omnis* litteram *i* vel *e* suprascripsit, quod *omneis* interpretati ubique olim in textum recepimus, at in F vocabulum tertiae declinationis in . . . *eis* nusquam finitur, extat ibi *oms*, *omis*, *ois* (ut *oia* et *omia*, i.e. *omnia*). quodsi Victorium *oms* significare *omnes* putasse censeas, alterum vero *omis omneis*, tertium denique *ois omnis*, tamen sibi non constat. itaque ne quid dubii sit, ubi in F *omis*, *ois*, *oms* extet adnotavimus. quod frequenter in hoc vocabulo factum est, in aliis quoque multis accidit, ut v. § 75, ubi Laetus *immortales* scripsit, Victorius *i* suprascripsit nec *e* deleuit, unde *immortaleis* olim recepimus, est vero in F *immortalis*." This is confirmed by the collation of F made by Groth and published in *Diss. Phil. Argent.* IV (1880), 81 f., and by the edition of Goetz-Schoell (1910). Neue-Wagener evidently used the edition of Mueller (1833), which contained a number of other instances also (cf. v, 65), or the earlier edition of L. Spengel (1826).

⁶ Keller in *R.M.* XXI (1866), 241 f.

⁷ Cf. Wagner, *Orth. Verg.* 404; Ribbeck, *Proll.* 413.

The following readings, however, may be noted :

cratēis, V, *Aen.* VII, 633, where note the expunged *e* ; CRINIIS, V, *Aen.* VIII, 34 "fuerat *crineis* ni fallor," R ; aur·is (aureis?) c, *Aen.* III, 294.

The following readings cited by Neue-Wagener I have been unable to confirm : parteis, Velleius, II, 97, 4 ; treis, Columella, IX, 7, 3 ; treis (nom.), Avienus, *Descr. Orb. Terr.* 683 ; *Ora Mar.* 579.

In the accusative plural *-eis* has thus far in the paper been explained as graphic for *-īs*. It is not improbable however that in one or two late instances the ending is to be considered as merely an arbitrary means of differentiating the accusative from the homonymous nominative ; for such may have been the idea of Pomponius Secundus, vid. Testimonia, 3, in writing the accusative *omneis* (= *omnes*?). Had Pomponius intended *omneis* to equal *omnis*, Pliny ought surely to have had no objection to the form. Asper at the end of Testimonia, 4, may have objected to the accusatives *omnes omneis* for the same reason. That *ei* was occasionally used for *ē* is seen in the forms DECREIVIT, *C.I.L.* II, 5041 ; LEIGIBUS, XIV, 2892.

The real difficulties in the testimonia are found in harmonizing those that purport to set forth the theory of Pliny. Exactly what his theory was is difficult to determine on account of our having him only in excerpts quoted out of their context and entangled with the theories of others, especially on account of the confusing way in which he cites Varro as favoring *-eis* in the accusative of certain words, vid. above pp. 130 and 135 f. Detlefsen in *Symb. Phil. Bonn.*, "zur Flexionslehre d. aelt. Plinius," pp. 710 f., gave the following interpretation of the Testimonia dealing with Pliny. Words having *-ium* in the genitive plural and increasing in the genitive singular formed their accusative plural in *-eis*, except those mentioned by Varro ; those not increasing in the genitive, even though they took *-ium* in the genitive plural, formed their accusative plural in *-es*. Accordingly Pliny wrote *fonteis monteis*, but *canes funes omnes*. Detlefsen searched the Mss. of the *Natural History* and also the palimpsests and

uncial fragments, but found not the slightest trace of an accusative in *-eis*. He therefore raised the questions:—

1. Did Pliny change his mind, or did he fail to carry out his theory in practice?
2. Did the later grammarians and editors of his work consistently change *-eis* to *-is*?
3. Was Charisius in error?

Detlefsen must have been somewhat confused through regarding the *eis* as diphthongal. Brambach, *Neugestaltung*, pp. 153 f., examined the matter more thoroughly, and modified the conclusions of Detlefsen so as to arrive at the accusative forms *fonteis monteis funes canes* but *omneis*; i.e. Pliny made certain exceptions to his general rule of forming the accusative in *-eis* when the genitive was *-ium*, but on the basis of our fragmentary information Brambach wisely refrained from formulating what Pliny's rule of exceptions was. More important still he recognized that in Pliny's time the question of *-eis* in the accusative had long been a dead issue. It may even be added that the theory of Pliny was almost certainly not a new one; indeed the fact that he cited Varro's exceptions (vid. *Testimonia*, 1) shows that it was old enough to be known to Varro, and that it had been propounded by one of Varro's contemporaries or predecessors, perhaps by Aelius Stilo.

The results of the above discussion are in the main destructive. The ostensible occurrences of *-eis* in the accusative in the Archaic Period—three from the inscription of the Columna Rostrata, nineteen from the Manuscripts of Plautus, one from Charisius' report of Naevius—are rejected as due to the influence of scholastic theory worked retroactively and out of bounds. It is not unlikely that the two occurrences cited for Caecilius and the one instance from Cato ought to be transferred from the beginning of Period II to the end of Period I, and rejected for similar reasons. Nearly all the authentic instances belong to the century immediately preceding the Age of Augustus. The influence of scholastic theory furthermore has not come from the ancients alone. After the

invention of printing a favorite device by which editors of Latin authors sought to give their texts an antique flavor was to print *-eis* in the accusative plural, and the practice seems to have been started by Aldus Manutius the elder. Thus it was that the termination came into the early modern texts of Horace through the work of Aldus, Lambinus, D. Heinsius and Cruquius; into those of Cicero through that of Gruter; more recently it has come into Varro through the fact that Victorius was misunderstood by L. Spengel and Mueller, from the influence of whom not even the latest revisions of Neue and Kuehner have been freed.